

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 7-12 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of May 10, 2010 all claims are rejected. With this response, claims 1 and 12 is amended, claims 7-11 are cancelled without prejudice and new claims 13-31 are added. All amendments and new claims are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections in view of the following discussion.

Claim Objections

In section 4, on page 3 of the Office Action, claim 1 is objected to due to informalities. Claim 1 is amended to recite “both said” as suggested by the Office. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 1.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 6, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Song et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,851,918) in view of Takizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,742,074), Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,160), Ide et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,492,582) and Endo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,174). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, because the cited references at least fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. The cited references, alone or in combination, at least fail to disclose or suggest that the second metallic line is extending from the terminal electrode to the substrate end, and that the second metallic line is formed beneath the insulating layer, as recited in claim 1.

In Takizawa and Lee, a terminal does not exist in the substrate end, and the second metallic line is not connected to the position where cutting off and chamfering off of the substrate are performed. Therefore, in Takizawa and Lee, the problem addressed by the present application, a generation of an insulation of a metallic layer due to cutting off and chamfering off does not occur. In Takizawa, terminals (20, 30) in a substrate periphery correspond to the terminal of the present application. Terminals in Figures 26, 27 and 28 have a wiring connection structure near a COG terminal for driver IC (22, 32), and do not correspond to an external connecting line of a terminal of the instant application in which the problem of an insulation due

to cutting off and chamfering off is dealt. In Lee, lines connected to a cutting line (11) described in Figure 3, terminals (101, 102), and shorting bars (102, 202) extending therefrom correspond to a connecting line connected to the terminal of the instant application. Since the structure of Figures 14 and 16 is in a side of a display area rather than a terminal, it does not correspond to an external connecting line of a terminal of the instant application.

Furthermore, applicant respectfully submits that in Song while the “C” region is a display area and the “D” region is a terminal region, a wavy line between “C” and “D” is an elliptic line and not a cutting off and chamfering off line. The position where cutting and chamfering off is performed appears to be in a right side of Figure 12. In Figure 12 of Song, the first metallic line is 24a, and the second metallic line is 34c, but the Office appears to reverse these designations on page 4 of the Office Action. In contrast to claim 1, as shown in Figure 12 of Song, Song’s metallic line 34c is formed in a side of a substrate end, not in a side of a display area. Therefore, in Song the insulating layer (28) standing between the metallic lines 24a and 34c exists on the metallic line 34c in a side of the substrate end. This is in contrast to the present invention where an insulator (gate insulating layer 4 in Figure 3b) exists under a metallic line in a side of the substrate end. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Claim 12 ultimately depends from independent claim 1, and therefore is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of its dependency.

New Claims 13-31

New independent claims 14 and 24 contain limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claims 14 and 24 are believed to be novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references.

The claims dependent from new independent claims 14 and 24 are believed to be novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references at least due to their dependencies.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Date: 31 August 2010

Respectfully submitted,



Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955